



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*ccw*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,758	06/27/2006	Thorsten Johann	13156-00058-US1	3499
30678	7590	12/31/2007	EXAMINER	
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP			DANG, THUAN D	
1875 EYE STREET, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1100			1797	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/31/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/584,758	JOHANN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thuan D. Dang	1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 September 2007.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 6-11 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 6-11 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/27/06; 9/27/06
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### *Specification*

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because (see below):

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "some cases steam" in step b cannot be understood by the examiner. Applicants are required to explain the meaning of cases steam. Is it a specific steam?

The term "the noncatalytic dehydrogenation" in claim 7 lacks an antecedent basis.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al (3,161,670).

Adams discloses a process including two steps of dehydrogenation of a butane stream to a product containing butadiene, the second product is separated by extractive distillation to

produce a stream containing unreacted reactants for recycle to the first reaction zone (see the abstract).

The examiner notes that the oxygen is absent in the first reaction zone and present in the second reaction zone. Therefore, there are no difference between the oxidative and non-oxidative conditions in the first and second dehydrogenation in the claimed process and the same in the Adams process.

It appears that Adams does not disclose what are contained in the recycle stream, namely butane and 2-butene as called for in claim 6. However, if butane and butene-2 are present in the second dehydrogenation product, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Adams process by recycling both since butane and butene-2 are required for the both dehydrogenation steps.

Since the Adams dehydrogenation step is carried out the same condition with the applicants' dehydrogenation step (no oxygen, the presence of a catalyst and same feed), this step is expected to be inherently autothermal.

It is well-known that LPG contains butane (see page 2, lines 26-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Adams process by using LPG as the butane feed since it is expected that using any feed containing butane would yield similar results.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al (3,161,670) in view of Boelt et al (2003/0220530).

Adams discloses a process as discussed above.

Adams does not discloses using N-methylpyrrolidone as the extractant. However, Boelt discloses N-methylpyrrolidone is used as an extractant in extraction distillation of paraffin and olefins. See [0033].

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Adams process by using N-methylpyrrolidone as extractant since it Boelt discloses N-methylpyrrolidone and acetonitrile can be equivalently used as extractants (Boelt" [0033]; Adams: col. 5, lines 28-30).

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams et al (3,161,670) in view of Gussow et al (4,558,168).

Adams discloses a process as discussed above.

Adams does not disclose that the butadiene is selectively converted to butenes as called for in claim 10 and 11. However, Gussow discloses that butadiene can be converted to butene(s) (the abstract).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the Adams process by selectively hydrogenating the butadiene to butene(s) to arrive at the applicants' claimed process if butene(s) is desired.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined

application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Rejection 1: Claims 6-8 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4-7 of copending Application No. 10/584,785 in view of Boelt et al (2003/0220530), claims 10 and 11 are rejected the same further in view of Gussow et al (4,558,168). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the conflicting claims do not disclose using an extractive distillation for separation of the dehydrogenation product and that the butadiene is selectively converted to butenes as called for in claim 10 and 11. However, Boelt discloses that paraffin and olefin can be separated by extractive distillation [0033]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the conflicting process by separating the dehydrogenation product by extractive distillation since it is expected that any method used for separation would yield similar results. Gussow discloses that butadiene can be converted to butene(s) (the abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have

modified the conflicting process by selectively hydrogenating the butadiene to butene(s) to arrive at the applicants' claimed process if butene(s) is desired.

Rejection 2: Claims 6-9 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5-10 of copending Application No. 10/584,783 and claims 10 and 11 are rejected the same further in view of Gussow et al (4,558,168).

The conflicting claims discloses a process substantially the same as the applicants' claimed process except that the conflicting claims do not disclose optional steps as called in the claims. However, these steps are optional.

Rejection 3: Claims 6-9 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 7-18 of copending Application No. 11/718,814 in view of Boelt et al (2003/0220530). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the conflicting claims do not disclose using an extractive distillation for separation of the dehydrogenation product and that the butadiene is selectively converted to butenes. However, Boelt discloses that paraffin and olefin can be separated by extractive distillation [0033]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the conflicting process by separating the dehydrogenation product by extractive distillation since it is expected that any method used for separation would yield similar results.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Rejection 4: Claims 6-9 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 7,034,195 in view of Boelt et al (2003/0220530). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the conflicting claims disclose a process substantially the same as the presently claimed process except that there are several minor differences such as using extractive distillation for the product of the dehydrogenation step. However, Boelt discloses that paraffin and olefin can be separated by extractive distillation [0033]. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the conflicting process by separating the dehydrogenation product by extractive distillation since it is expected that any method used for separation would yield similar results.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuan D. Dang whose telephone number is 571-272-1445. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Calderola can be reached on 571-272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thuan D. Dang /  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1797

10584758.20071221